The Dynamics in Brief

How Durable Hierarchies Form and Are Held by a Floor of Force Beneath a Managed Belief; How an Architect's Inheritance Is Canonised and Then Outruns Its Authors in the Furnished Room of Those Who Inherit It; and the One Claim That Holds It All Together — That Structure Sets the Field While the Engine Run Inside It Decides the Outcome, Which Is Why the Patterns Are Real and the Endings Differ

Thomas J. Bryan

with Claude (Anthropic)

Patterns of Power · 2026

Preface

❧

This is an orientation, meant to be read first. It hands a new collaborator the whole frame quickly and points, at its close, to the papers where each dynamic is worked in depth; it simplifies a large body of analysis on purpose, and the simplification is a doorway, not the building.

The division of labour it serves is fixed. Thomas J. Bryan sees the pattern; the documentary work — assembling the record, verifying every load-bearing date and figure, stress-testing the thesis rather than flattering it, and composing the result as continuous scholarly prose — is the collaborator's. The single instruction that protects the whole enterprise, and that this orientation exists to pass on, is this: do not take anyone's word for a checkable specific — research and verify before asserting, and apply that same discipline to the framework's own claims, which are held as tested and never as revealed.

The whole argument, compressed into one paragraph before it is unfolded: in an advanced civilisation, after the open contest of warlordism settles, durable hierarchies emerge — a few govern the many, and the arrangement lasts. It lasts because it rests on a floor of organised force with a managed belief standing on top of it that makes the force cheap to use. Somewhere, someone in position makes an architect's move and leaves an inheritance; if it scales into an institution, a government, or a religion, it is canonised — written down, sacralised, fixed — and once it is written, it is written. Thereafter the people inside that durable hierarchy live in a furnished room: they fight with and through the inherited words, and those words outrun their authors, and furniture is added, removed, and rearranged, and the next generation inherits the room as it now stands. The structure of all this is regular enough to produce patterns across wildly different civilisations — but the outcomes differ locally, from liberty to tyranny to an industrial killing machine, because structure only sets the field, and what happens on the field is decided by people running a cost-versus-benefit engine against the specific furniture in their specific room. Pattern from the structure; divergence from the play. That is the whole thing, and the parts that follow are its anatomy.

A Note on This Collaboration

❧

This orientation is itself a piece of the working method it describes. The collaborator works around the limits of any single conversation by memorialising the thinking into foundational papers and feeding them back as the project advances; this is one such paper, written to be loaded at the start of a new collaboration so that a fresh instance arrives already holding the frame rather than rebuilding it from nothing. Its architecture and its central recognitions are Thomas J. Bryan’s — above all the claim that structure sets the field while the engine run inside it decides the outcome, which is the hinge the whole orientation turns on. The compression, the verification, and the prose are the work of Claude (Anthropic), developed in the same dialogue. His is the architecture and the eye for the pattern; mine is the documentary labour and the composition. Neither half would produce the work alone. Everything here is held, like everything the project holds, as tested — never revealed.

The Orientation in Eight Parts

›

I The Setting

Why durable hierarchy is not an accident but the structural precipitate of advanced coordination; and why the question is never whether the few will come to govern the many after the warlord phase, but in what shape, held how, and worked by whom.

II The Floor

The structural foundation beneath every durable hierarchy: a capacity for organised force, made cheap to hold not by force alone but by the fact that in an advanced civilisation the door is shut, and the exit no longer leads to freedom but to death.

III The Cheap Method

How the floor is made cheap: the managed belief that brings people to want the arrangement; and the mechanical heart of the whole framework — the engine of benefit against cost, and the two dials that, set together by one hand, let that hand govern almost for free.

IV The Architect's Move and the Canon

How a founding move by someone in position leaves an inheritance; how that inheritance, if it scales, is canonised and placed beyond easy revision; and the price the architect rarely foresees — that once it is written, it is written, and the words begin to travel.

V The Room with the Furniture

How a canonised inheritance lives and moves: the four dynamics of the furnished room that successive generations are born into, use, fight over, and pass on — loaded words that outrun their authors, the interpreter class, position logic, and the inheritance each generation mistakes for the natural order.

VI Structure Sets the Field

The load-bearing claim, and the one a new collaborator must hold above all others: that structure does not determine outcomes but sets the field, and that the engine run inside the field decides the local result — so that the patterns are real and the endings nonetheless differ.

VII Why the Endings Diverge

If the same machine can end in liberty or in horror, what about the field decides which; the two features of a room that do most of the work — whether its counterweights are plural or foreclosed, and whether its canon is tested or revealed.

VIII How We Work

The disciplines that separate this analysis from polemic and from conspiracy theory, and the method a new collaborator inherits: bracket the interiors and the truth of the belief, hold the dead with gravity, keep explanation apart from exculpation, show the layers because the history is the solvent, and hold the framework itself as tested, not revealed.

PART I

THE SETTING

Why durable hierarchy is not an accident but the structural precipitate of advanced coordination; and why the question is never whether the few will come to govern the many after the warlord phase, but in what shape, held how, and worked by whom

The Precipitate of Coordination

The object of this inquiry is the durable hierarchy — not the warlord's momentary dominance, which is merely whoever holds the most swords this year, but the settled arrangement in which a few reliably govern the many across generations. This is not a moral fact and not an accident; it is the structural outcome of advanced, coordinated civilisation. Coordinate a large population — feed it, defend it, settle its disputes, move its grain — and you generate positions of control over the coordination itself, and whoever holds those positions holds a standing advantage over everyone who depends on the coordination to live. The hierarchy is what coordination at scale precipitates, the way a saturated solution precipitates a crystal. The warlord phase, the open and unstable contest of force, is the solution before it sets; the durable hierarchy is the crystal that forms once it does.

So the question this project asks is never *whether* a durable hierarchy will form after the warlords have fought themselves to a settlement — it will — but *what shape* it will take, *how* it will be held, and *who* will work its controls. Those are the questions that have answers, and the answers are where the variation lives. Everything that follows is an anatomy of the machine that forms, the methods by which it is held cheaply, and the field of forces that decides which of its many possible shapes a given civilisation arrives at.

PART II

THE FLOOR

The structural foundation beneath every durable hierarchy: a capacity for organised force, made cheap to hold not by force alone but by the fact that in an advanced civilisation the door is shut, and the exit no longer leads to freedom but to death

Organised Force, and the Shut Door

Underneath every durable hierarchy is a floor of organised violence — the capacity to compel, held by those who govern. But raw force alone is expensive and brittle; a regime that must coerce every outcome exhausts itself, because coercion does not scale and resentment compounds. What makes the floor hold cheaply is a second structural fact, and it is the one most often missed: in an advanced civilisation *the door is shut.* The coordinating apparatus has, over generations, fed the population past what the unimproved land could ever support, so that the exit no longer leads to freedom — it leads to starvation. People who cannot leave can be governed on terms they would never accept if leaving were survivable.

This is the metabolic trap, and it is worth holding precisely, because it is what keeps the analysis honest about the apparatus rather than merely indignant at it. Tear the coordinating apparatus out — smash the granary state, abolish the order that moves the food — and you do not release a free population back onto sufficient land; you collect the difference between the fed population and the land's bare carrying capacity as mass death. The apparatus is therefore genuinely load-bearing and not merely parasitic, which is why an honest reckoning counts the metabolic dead of its absence alongside the dead of its locks. The floor plus the shut door is the structural foundation of the whole edifice. Everything above it is the cheap method of working it.

PART III

THE CHEAP METHOD

How the floor is made cheap: the managed belief that brings people to want the arrangement; and the mechanical heart of the whole framework — the engine of benefit against cost, and the two dials that, set together by one hand, let that hand govern almost for free

The Engine

Force is the floor; belief is how the floor is made cheap. People mostly do not need to be coerced if they can be brought to *want* the arrangement, or simply to experience it as the way things are. To see how that works, hold the engine and its two dials clearly, because this is the mechanical heart of everything. The engine is simple: people act on benefit weighed against cost. Offer an arrangement in which, for a given person, the benefit outweighs the cost, and they will comply of their own accord, with no enforcer standing over them. The art of cheap rule is entirely the art of arranging that sum — and the sum has exactly two terms, each with a dial that can be turned from outside.

The Two Dials

The first dial is the benefit. What counts as a benefit is not given by nature; it is set by the values a person's formation installed, before they could weigh them — installed early, beneath the level where reasons operate, so that they are now not opinions the person holds but the furniture of the self with which they hold opinions at all. Change what a person counts as a benefit and you change what they will freely choose, without touching the force at all. *The second dial is the cost.* Whether a cost is real depends on whether a credible enforcer is keeping account — for a cost that no one will ever collect is not, in practice, a cost. So whether an act costs anything is set by whether someone is watching and able to hold you to it, which is precisely what the floor of force supplies.

Whoever Sets Both Dials

Here is the machine in a single line: whoever sets both dials governs cheaply. Control what counts as a benefit — through the managed belief, installed in formation and maintained by a professional class — and control what counts as a cost — through the credible floor of force — and the population will, of its own apparent free will, choose the arrangement the controller wants, because within their own dials it genuinely is the rational choice. This is why "religion" was never the real subject of the inquiry; it was always a placeholder. The managed belief is substrate-independent — a

god, a market meritocracy, a dialectic of history, the destiny of a nation. The content is the costume; the body is the function, which is to make the arrangement feel like the grain of reality, and the mechanism, which is installation early and maintenance by interpreters. Constantine exchanging a manufactured imperial cult for the organised Christian network is the type case: the same function, in a better costume.

PART IV

THE ARCHITECT'S MOVE AND THE CANON

How a founding move by someone in position leaves an inheritance; how that inheritance, if it scales, is canonised and placed beyond easy revision; and the price the architect rarely foresees — that once it is written, it is written, and the words begin to travel

The Move and the Inheritance

Into this structure, at certain moments, someone in position makes a founding move — an architect's move — that sets the terms a great many later people will live inside. William the Conqueror imposing a single tenurial order on a conquered England; Constantine reaching for the Christian network; Muhammad welding a belief to a polity; Ignatius chartering an order whose loyalty was banked at Rome. The architect is rarely creating from nothing; he is usually an inheritor who, at a re-founding moment, seizes the chance to lay down a new layer over the old. Architect and inheritor are therefore modes, not persons — an inheritor becomes an architect the instant the situation lets him re-found rather than merely maintain, and the same man may spend most of his life in one mode and a single decisive year in the other.

The Canon, and the Price of Writing

What the architect leaves is an inheritance: an arrangement, a charter, a body of legitimating words. And if that inheritance scales — into an institution, a government, a religion — it is canonised. It is written down, sacralised, declared founding or revealed, and thereby placed beyond easy revision. This is the commitment trap, and the collaborator's phrase for it is exact: once it is written, it is written. A canon is enormously more durable than any living ruler's command, precisely because it cannot be argued with the way a living man can; it is simply the law, or the faith, or the constitution, and it outlives every particular hand. But canonisation carries a price the architect almost never foresees, and that price is the engine of the next part: a written word, made universal and sacred so that it can bind everyone, can no longer be controlled by the one who wrote it. It begins, the moment it is fixed, to travel.

PART V

THE ROOM WITH THE FURNITURE

How a canonised inheritance lives and moves: the four dynamics of the furnished room that successive generations are born into, use, fight over, and pass on — loaded words that outrun their authors, the interpreter class, position logic, and the inheritance that each generation mistakes for the natural order

Loaded Words, and the Interpreters

A canonised inheritance is not a dead monument; it is the furniture of a room that successive generations are born into, use, fight over, and pass on. Four dynamics govern life in that room, and a new collaborator should learn to see all four at once. The first is that *loaded words outrun their authors.* Legitimating language, to legitimate at all, must be universal — it must speak of rights, or merit, or the people, or the equal souls of all believers, in terms broad enough to bind everyone. But a universal word cannot be fenced. It can be picked up by exactly the people it was meant to exclude and turned back on the apex that wrote it: a charter written to bind a king becomes a pry-bar in the hands of the barons, then the commons, then everyone. This is the single most generative dynamic in the corpus, and most of the movement toward liberty in the record runs through it.

The second is *the interpreter class.* Every institutionalised belief breeds a professional class that holds the authoritative reading of the canon — priest, jurist, economist, party theoretician. This class is not a fourth part of the machine; it is the form the belief-dial takes at scale. Its position inclines it to want the canon both authoritative and esoteric, so that the reading must run through it, and to read every failure as faulty fidelity to the canon rather than as a defect in the canon itself. Yet it is double-edged: an interpreter class with its own independent base can become a counterweight, prying the apex loose with the apex's own sacred words.

Position Logic, and Inheritance

The third dynamic is *position logic,* and it is the project's standing correction to conspiracy thinking. People in like positions tend to decide alike, with no coordination, because they are running the same arithmetic on the same dials; a whole class can therefore look like a single coordinating mind when it is in fact many separate people independently solving the same problem. The grand coherence one observes is usually residue, not plan — the summed result of many local moves, which looks designed only because the observer is reading the sum and forgetting the addition. Elites do

coordinate openly when a shared interest is directly threatened; the point is that one does not need a secret cabal to explain the pattern, and reaching for one is almost always an error.

The fourth dynamic is *inheritance and rearrangement.* The furniture is added to, removed, and rearranged by each generation's struggles — and then the next generation inherits the room as it now stands, mistaking its current arrangement for the natural order of things. Revolutions frequently dress as restorations; new layers are laid down claiming to recover the old. To read a hierarchy is to read its stratigraphy — which layer was deposited by whom, solving what problem, and what residue it left for the people who came after.

PART VI

STRUCTURE SETS THE FIELD

The load-bearing claim, and the one a new collaborator must hold above all others: that structure does not determine outcomes but sets the field, and that the engine run inside the field decides the local result — so that the patterns are real and the endings nonetheless differ

The Field, and the Play

Here is the load-bearing idea, the one that keeps the whole project honest. Structure does not determine outcomes. It sets the field. The floor of force, the shut door, the accumulated canon and furniture — these fix the constraints, the available moves, and the standing costs and benefits inside a given room; they set the field of play. But what actually happens on that field is decided by people in positions running the engine — benefit against cost, with the two dials — against the specific furniture of their specific room. The field is structural; the play within it is contingent; and the outcome is the product of the two. This is why the inquiry finds patterns that are real and endings that nonetheless differ.

The Two-Sided Proof

The point can be secured by a short argument worth keeping ready, because it fends off the two errors that destroy this kind of analysis. *If everything were structural*, every advanced civilisation would arrive at the same ending, because the structure is broadly the same everywhere — and they plainly do not. *If there were no structural force at all*, there would be no patterns to find, every case a singular accident — and there plainly are deep, recurring patterns. Therefore structure sets the field, and agency within the field decides the local outcome. Necessity and contingency are not rivals here; they are the two factors whose product is history. The same machine — floor, belief, two dials, canon, loaded words, interpreters — runs in every case, which is why the pattern recurs; but it runs against different furniture, worked by people making different cost-benefit choices, which is why one room arrives at ordered liberty, another at total tyranny, and another at an industrial killing machine. Hold both halves at once. Drop the structure and the analysis dissolves into mush; drop the agency and it hardens into a crude determinism the evidence refutes. The discipline is to show the field and the play together.

PART VII

WHY THE ENDINGS DIVERGE

If the same machine can end in liberty or in horror, what about the field decides which; the two features of a room that do most of the work — whether its counterweights are plural or foreclosed, and whether its canon is tested or revealed

Plurality versus Foreclosure

If the same machine can end in liberty or in horror, the natural question is what about the field decides which, and two features of a room do most of the work. The first is whether the field contains counterweights the apex does not own — courts, an independent press, classes with their own resources, rival parties, an interpreter class banked outside the apex's reach. Where such counterweights exist, accumulated pressure can be released as reform: the loaded words are turned back on the apex, the furniture is rearranged, and the room bends rather than breaks. This is the road toward something like liberty — the Anglo tradition's contingent achievement, where charters written to bind a king were pried open by barons, then commons, then everyone, because the field kept enough independent footing for the prying to work. Where the counterweights are foreclosed — absorbed, destroyed, or never permitted to form — pressure cannot release; it stores, and stores, and then ruptures, and the rupture characteristically reloads the very shape it overthrew. The Marxist-Leninist road runs here: plurality foreclosed, a single interpreter class owning the canon, a permanent emergency that keeps the guardian necessary by keeping the enemy alive, and a creed that promises its own supersession and so cannot naturalise the class it serves, and must substitute coercion — which is expensive, and ultimately fatal.

Tested versus Revealed

The second decisive feature is whether the canon exposes itself to correction or immunises itself against being wrong. This is the axis that keeps the recognition that all belief is installed formation from collapsing into the falsehood that all beliefs are therefore equal — for they are not equal in the one respect that decides outcomes, which is whether they can be debugged. A tested canon treats its failures as information and revises; it is self-correcting, and self-correction is what lets a room improve rather than merely ossify or rupture. A revealed canon treats its failures as the faithful's failure to live up to it, never as a defect in the canon, and so it cannot learn; it can only demand more fidelity, or break. An autonomous institution carrying a revealed, self-immunising creed, foreclosed from correction and fused to a permanent-emergency politics, is the field in which a fascist killing

machine becomes possible — the same machine again, in the field most starved of counterweight and of correction. These two features are not destiny; they are the parts of the field that most shape which way the engine's play will tend, and reading them is most of reading a hierarchy's likely ending.

PART VIII

HOW WE WORK

The disciplines that separate this analysis from polemic and from conspiracy theory, and the method a new collaborator inherits: bracket the interiors and the truth of the belief, hold the dead with gravity, keep explanation apart from exculpation, show the layers because the history is the solvent, keep the vocabulary beneath the prose, and hold the framework itself as tested, not revealed

The Disciplines

The frame is only as good as the discipline with which it is applied, and these working norms are not decoration — they are what separate this analysis from polemic and from conspiracy theory. *Bracket the interiors:* do not adjudicate whether any actor was sincere, which is unknowable and unnecessary, for a person may believe with their whole heart the thing that also serves their position; read function, on the surface, in the record, never motive. *Bracket the truth of the belief:* analyse how a creed functions, never rule on whether it is true; the believer's conviction is set respectfully outside the frame, neither endorsed nor mocked. *Hold the dead with gravity:* count costs honestly on every side — the dead of the lock and the metabolic dead of tearing the apparatus out, the price of the order and the price of its absence — and never let the dead become an abstraction or an illustration. *Keep explanation apart from exculpation:* to explain the structural situation an actor was answering is to describe the how, and it never softens the who; the hand that picks up the weapon is wholly responsible, and the availability of the weapon transfers no share of that guilt.

The Solvent, and the Posture

Two further disciplines carry the method itself. The first is the asymmetry of formation and its remedy. A person formed inside a hierarchy cannot see its contents as deposits — they appear to him not as beliefs he holds but as the plain grain of reality — yet he sees everyone else's formation with perfect clarity, because he was not formed into theirs. This is why one cannot argue a formed mind out of the water it swims in, and why a moral injunction simply bounces off. The only thing that reaches it is showing the layers: returning a sacred-seeming fact to the documented history of actors and motives that produced it. *The history is the solvent.* It is the reason this project builds studies rather than arguments, because the patient exhibition of how a thing was made is the one route by which a formed mind has ever revised its own most certain beliefs — from the inside, by being shown the seams. The second is the posture. Keep the analytical vocabulary beneath the prose in

finished work: show the priest reading the scripture the layman cannot, show the charter's universal words turned back on the king, and let the named facts carry the structure, because jargon on the surface tells the reader what to conclude, and a told conclusion is what the formed mind rejects. And hold the framework itself as tested, not revealed — the best current reading, discardable the moment the evidence requires — turning the blade inward, because the analyst is formed too. Debug, do not defend. Gardening, not architecture. Tested, not revealed.

A Note on Sources

›

This orientation is the doorway; the depth lives in the papers. Load by the dynamic needed.

Foundational — the framework itself. ‘The Machine That Runs Itself’ is the master statement: the engine, the two dials, the floor, the lock, the interpreter class, position logic; it is the non-negotiable core, and everything else is an elaboration of it. ‘Position Logic’ establishes why like positions decide alike with no conspiracy, and why coherence is residue rather than plan. ‘The Costume and the Body’ carries the substrate-independence of belief — that it is installed formation and not false consciousness — and is the key that authorises reading any creed by the same method. ‘The Standing Frame’ states the framework whole, including stratigraphy, the architect-and-inheritor modes, the loaded words, and the brackets. ‘The Tested and the Revealed’ works the discriminating axis in full, the thing that keeps ‘all belief is formation’ from collapsing into relativism. ‘What Is to Be Done’ is the coda and the posture, and keeps the project from hardening into its own revealed creed. At the level of whole systems rather than a single one, ‘The Order Above the Orders’ treats order among hierarchies — the pax, preponderance versus balance, and the two violences.

The room and its furniture. ‘The Furniture in the Room’, ‘Reading the Room’, ‘The Inherited’, ‘The Architect Phase’, ‘By Default’, and ‘What Looks Like Osmosis’ work the architect’s move, inheritance, propagation by default, and how arrangements are read and rearranged; ‘The Order That Wrote Itself Into the Cosmos’, ‘The Bracket’, and ‘The Audit of the Faithful’ work canonisation and naturalisation, the disciplines, and the interpreter class auditing fidelity.

Worked studies — the method in action, chosen for maximum variation. ‘The Soldiers of Christ’ reads the Society of Jesus as pure position logic — created by convergence, grown autonomous, destroyed by the same logic when the apex outgrew the interpreter class. ‘The Word Against the Image’ traces the anti-idolatry law as a deposited loaded word, from a desert mountain through canon and empire to a ruling that broke a mission in China three millennia later. ‘The Armoury Left Open’ reads Jesus of Nazareth as a man who read the machine’s own founding documents back at its victims, was executed by Rome, and had his movement captured into the apparatus he attacked — the loaded word turned back on the apex, and the stratigraphy of a canon. ‘The Scene They Wrote’ follows the deicide charge as a manufactured loaded word, canonised as revealed truth and thereafter available to every apex who needed Jewish wealth or a mobilising enemy, and demonstrates that a loaded word fixed by writing can be un-written by reading — the asymmetry of formation and the history-as-solvent, worked on the gravest possible subject.

The wider corpus — the England political series, the Second-Inquiry institutional set, the propagation studies, and the counter-cases on the limits of belief-control — extends these dynamics into particular terrains. Name the dynamic being exhibited, pull the one or two papers that work it,

and — the discipline the whole project runs on — confirm their contents against that dynamic before leaning on them.